1

Interpreting: An Overview

LEN ROBERSON

Defining Terms: What Is It We Do?

An interpreter conveys what is said or signed in one language into another language while maintaining the original intended message. *Interpreting* allows two or more individuals who do not share a common language to engage in a communicative interaction through a person who is bilingual. Signed language interpreters render "a spoken or signed source language message into a spoken or signed target language in real time" (International Organization for Standardization, 2014, p. 1).

Within the field of signed language interpretation, interpreters not only work between two or more languages, but also between different forms of the same language. This process, working between different forms of the same language, is referred to as *transliterating*. According to Winston (1989), transliterating is "a specific form of sign language interpreting." It is the process of changing one form of an English message, either spoken English or signed English, into the other form. *Translation*, although often confused with interpreting, is a unique, albeit closely related, linguistic discipline. Translation is the process of converting a message in one printed language to the same message in another printed language while retaining all of the original meaning. Translators, like interpreters, work to not only maintain the integrity of the message itself, but also to include cultural understanding in the translation. There are times when signed language interpreters perform a similar task known as *sight translation*, working from a printed text into sign language. For example, an interpreter may have to translate an intake document in a doctor's office for a Deaf consumer who

prefers to have the form signed. In essence, the key difference between these two linguistic processes is in the medium of the work; translation involves a written text, whereas interpreting occurs between spoken and/or signed languages.

Service Delivery

Interpreting can be done in a number of ways, but it is typically accomplished either in person or via some form of technology. In-person interpreting is by far the more common method of interpreting and certainly, for many Deaf and hard of hearing individuals, the preferred method. However, recent advances in technology have created opportunities for interpreting to occur without the physical presence of an interpreter. For the field of sign language interpreting, this is a rather new occurrence. The availability of high-definition video technology allows interpreters to be in one location while the individuals who are communicating are in two different locations. Although interpreting services using technology are constantly improving and serve a general purpose for non-urgent interpreting, there is still a need for research on the effectiveness of technology-based interpreting in the areas of high-risk interpreting (e.g., medical and legal interpreting). Although many deaf and hard of hearing individuals enjoy the use of technology-based interpreting for everyday tasks, such as calling a friend, ordering a meal, or making an appointment, these same individuals often prefer a live interpreter to be present with them during other interpreted events.

In-Person Interpreting

Interpreters who work in a live setting have direct and in-person access to all parties engaged in communication. Often, this means managing the physical space and environment as well as the discourse exchange between speakers. For example, when interpreting in person, an interpreter is often the individual who ensures the arrangement of all parties in the room is supportive of full and equal access to all as well the general management of such environmental factors as lighting, seating, and audio/visual materials. Interpreters working in a live setting have an easier time with turn-taking,

the volume of the spoken message, and visual access to extra items and people present that may not be easily accessible via technology.

Signed language interpreters work as *independent (freelance) contractors*, or as *staff interpreters*. Independent contractors provide their services to many different people. They can obtain jobs through a signed language interpreting agency or by contracting directly with companies and people in need of interpreting services. These interpreters work on a fee-for-service basis, and they are paid by the hour or by the day or week. They can work for more than one company or person at a time, but they are not employees of any one agency or company; they are self-employed. As such, they are responsible for paying taxes on a quarterly schedule.

Staff interpreters are salaried workers in an organization, and they provide interpreting services for employees, visitors, or customers. Many businesses, organizations, and agencies (e.g., K–12 and postsecondary school systems, government agencies, hospitals, state and federal court systems, and private corporations) hire full-time interpreters. According to AIIC, "career paths of staff interpreters vary widely" with many staff interpreters remaining with a single organization for many years (see International Association of Conference Interpreters, 2011). Staff interpreting positions may include other responsibilities (e.g., managing interpreting services for the organization, administrative support services, providing accessibility consultation and training, etc.), and often build in time to prepare for specific assignments and other duties. Staff interpreter positions are usually salaried, include benefits, and often provide for regular salary increases, opportunities for professional development and training, as well as advancement opportunities. Another benefit of a staff interpreter position is the development of collegial relationships with other employees, both Deaf and hearing.

A staff interpreter may also be a *designated interpreter*; that is, hired to work alongside a Deaf professional to interpret all of the individual's interaction with nonsigning individuals (e.g., customers, patients, and co-workers). Designated interpreters have been hired to work with Deaf doctors, lawyers, engineers, real estate agents, artists, educators, and corporate administrators, to name a few. Designated interpreters must have excellent linguistic and interpreting skills, expertise in a particular field or profession, including terminology, and a strong partnership with the

Deaf professionals with whom they work. The book *Deaf Professionals and Designated Interpreters: A New Paradigm* is an excellent resource for understanding the work of designated interpreters.

Interpreting via Technology

Interpreting, in a fundamental sense, is about access. From the time the telephone was developed, technology has had a part in providing access. Although deaf people could not use the telephone themselves, they would ask a hearing family member or friend who signed to make the call, so they could engage in conversation with someone. With the advent of telecommunications devices for the deaf (TDDs), deaf people could call each other over the telephone lines and type their conversations. Access to the telephone became more widely available when the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) required (see Title IV of the ADA) telephone companies to provide relay services across the United States. The early relay services used a TDD and involved a hearing person, a deaf person, and a communication assistant (interpreter) to relay the messages back and forth. All of the parties involved in the call were in a different location.

New video technologies have made it possible for interpreters to work in one location for an entire shift and to handle calls from many different locations. The newest forms of technology-related interpreting are video remote interpreting (VRI) and video-relay service interpreting (VRS). Both types rely on computers or other similar devices with video capabilities and broadband internet access to connect Deaf and hearing individuals with an interpreter. The interpreter can then facilitate the communication between all parties.

There are fundamental differences between these two services. Video-relay services are provided by companies who specialize in this form of interpreting. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) reimburses the companies and requires that the parties (the Deaf person, the hearing person, and the signed language interpreter) cannot be in the same location.

VRI services are often used when two of the parties (e.g., the Deaf and hearing person, the Deaf person and the interpreter, or the interpreter and the hearing, nonsigning person) are in the same room. The VRI service provider usually has a contract with the individual or organization

requesting the interpreting services. Both VRI and VRS allow interpreters to work from remote locations that may be far from the physical location of the assignment. Although this seems to be an excellent solution for access, often the communication may prove to be ineffective due to limitations in bandwidth, difficulty in viewing a multidimensional language on a flat screen, and the challenges of interacting with all parties and the environment via video technologies. VRI may not be the right solution for all situations or all individuals involved, and its use should be carefully considered and the benefits and limitations weighed before using.

Settings

General

Signed language interpreters have many opportunities to work in a variety of settings with diverse groups of individuals. Some of these settings require specialized skill sets, training, and experience. This is especially true for educational, medical, and legal interpreting.

Although a list of potential settings can be considered and presented, in reality, an interpreter *could* work in any situation in which a Deaf person interacts with others who cannot communicate on their own with the Deaf person. This suggests endless possibilities for where an interpreter *could* work. Such possibilities might include any of the following:

- working as a full-time staff interpreter for a company, corporation, or organization
- health care (i.e., doctor's office, hospital, surgical center)
- educational (i.e., preschool–12th grade, college, technical school, continuing education)
- legal (i.e., attorney–client meetings, court, mediation, law enforcement)
- conferences and meetings
- social clubs and activities
- vacation and holiday events (i.e., amusement parks, cruises, travel tours)
- sporting teams, events
- theater and musical performances
- religious services, events
- family events (i.e., funerals, weddings, family reunions)

Educational

Educational interpreters provide services in settings that involve teaching and learning. These settings range from traditional classrooms (preschool through college) to continuing education classes, adult learning opportunities, employee training within work settings, and even postsecondary training programs. Interpreters have been used in schools and educational environments for many decades; however, the field of educational interpreting has experienced significant growth thanks to federal legislation, particularly the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and its reauthorization as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990, 2004). Although residential schools for the deaf have had a long history of educating both deaf and hard of hearing students, the recent and current focus on inclusion as an educational practice has significantly increased the number of deaf and hard of hearing students being educated alongside their hearing peers throughout the public schools of the United States. This increase in placements has necessitated the growth of the number of educational interpreters employed by school districts.

Educational interpreters can expect their duties and responsibilities to vary, depending on the school system in which they work. Some schools require interpreters to interpret not only for academic classes, but also for extracurricular activities, which can include athletic events, student organization meetings, student clubs, and even on-the-job training work experiences and internships. They may also expect the interpreter to fulfill other responsibilities as a staff member within the school. A growing trend in the area of educational interpreting is that interpreters are hired predominately for interpreting work and less frequently for other responsibilities, such as general classroom assistance, administrative support assistance, or in other noninstructional duties.

Qualifications vary dramatically from school system to school system and even among schools within a school system. Although some educational institutions or systems require interpreters to have national certification, many school systems or institutions do not require any certification at all. Although some school systems and schools do require advanced preparation, experience, or degrees related to the work of an interpreter, many often classify signed language interpreters as *paraprofessionals* or other general educational

staff members and as such may require only a high school diploma and other minimal skills. In some states, licensure as an interpreter is required, which often requires national certification as an interpreter. In her chapter on "Credentialing and Regulation of Signed Language Interpreters," Witter-Merithew (this volume) addresses interpreting credentials in greater detail, including the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA). This has been extremely controversial over the years, because professionals who work within the field of deaf education as well as families and parents all agree that deaf children deserve the best skilled and experienced interpreters as possible. Often well-meaning individuals who know sign language get hired as educational interpreters despite the fact that they do not have the necessary language or interpreting skills to provide effective, efficient, and accurate interpretation to the students they are hired to serve. This jeopardizes deaf students' access not only to education, but also to the future.

For many deaf children whose families do not use sign language themselves, access to language comes most often through the hands of their educational interpreters. Similarly, deaf students who are educated entirely in a mainstream situation can gain access to education only through the hands of their signed language interpreters. This is a significant responsibility, and one that should not be taken lightly. Deaf students' access to education and language will have a lasting impact on their lives. Like teachers, educational interpreters must continually further their language skills, subject-area knowledge, and understanding of students' needs at various stages of their education.

"Interpreting in the educational setting requires additional knowledge and skills relevant to children" (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2010). Interpreters in educational settings should have a degree from an interpreter education program and have taken courses in educational interpreting, child development, and generally in the education of deaf children. Interpreters in educational settings should hold certification as a signed language interpreter preferably at a national level and should also hold an undergraduate degree in signed language interpreting or the educational field. According to data collected and shared by the Distance Opportunities for Interpreters and Teachers Center at the University of Northern Colorado, 42 states use the EIPA as, or as part of, their standards for educational interpreting (Johnson, Bolster, & Brown, 2014).

Healthcare

Everyone needs access to medical services and healthcare; however, without an interpreter, many deaf people are denied this access. Medical, or healthcare, interpreting can occur in a variety of settings, including, but not limited to, physician offices, hospitals, urgent care centers, mental health counseling, school healthcare clinics, and surgical care centers. Although providing interpreting services in any situation deserves attention and best practices, healthcare interpreting involves relaying extremely sensitive and personal information between the deaf person and the healthcare professional. As one might expect, the deaf patient may be worried, concerned, frightened, or in pain. All of these emotions can affect an interpreter's ability to communicate effectively; therefore, interpreters should take special care in providing adequate and effective communication in medical settings.

Although there are currently no national standards or special certifications for medical interpreting, as is the case with other forms of specialized interpreting (e.g., legal interpreting), interpreters working in healthcare settings must be highly competent, with both the skills and experience to effectively interpret in complex situations. Healthcare interpreting assignments are filled with special terminology, processes, and procedures that may have a high potential for risk and complications. Interpreters should be aware of their role in the communicative interaction between doctor and patient, their placement during medical assignments, and the potential for specialized vocabulary knowledge and skills necessary for the assignment. In her chapter on healthcare interpreting, Dr. Laurie Swabey (this volume) presents additional details on interpreters working in healthcare settings and suggests that the ability to recognize when an interpreting specialist is needed is a necessary skill for competent interpreters. Swabey also identifies the knowledge and skills needed by healthcare interpreters.

Placement of the interpreter during a medical appointment is often different than that in traditional interpreting assignments. The interpreter, in consultation with the deaf patient and potentially the medical professional, should give consideration to the best place to be during the appointment, to ensure the deaf patient has a clear line of sight to the interpreter at all times. Although this may seem obvious and applicable to all interpreting work, one should realize that it is not uncommon in medical situations for

patients to be placed face down on a table or lying on their sides facing the wall; and in both situations, the view of the interpreter may not be adequate. The interpreter should work with the deaf patient and the medical professional to ensure an appropriate line of sight during the assignment at all times.

Special consideration should also be given to the appropriate protocol to follow during a medical interpreting assignment, which may be different from standard operating procedures for other, more general, types of interpreting. For example, while interpreting in a general community setting, it may be appropriate for the interpreter to always be near the deaf participants and available to them throughout the assignment. In a medical situation, however, it may be more appropriate to not be with the deaf patient at all times. There may be times when the deaf patient is asked to change into a medical gown or an occasion where a physical is going to include the doctor's examination of the deaf patient's body, and in both situations, the interpreter should appropriately step out of the room. The interpreter in these situations would need to ensure that the deaf patient understands the instructions of the medical professional and what will occur as part of the procedure prior to stepping out of the room. It is often seen as beneficial for interpreters in medical settings to follow the other professionals in their protocol and apply that protocol accordingly to the role of the interpreter.

One of the reasons interpreting in medical settings is considered a specialty area is because of the necessity for the interpreter to be familiar with special terms, specialized signs, and medical procedures and processes, and be able to effectively communicate the procedures and processes to the deaf patient. Even though an interpreter may be very experienced in personally going to the doctor or seeking medical care, the ability to explain complicated processes and medical terminology in another language is often found to be very difficult. Interpreters who specialize in medical interpreting often spend time studying medical terminology and working with other experts to find the best and most accurate interpretation of the terms. There is often a need to expand upon what might be seen as a simple statement or question, to be fully understood in a second language. Part of an interpreter's role is to help educate the medical professionals as to the interpreter's integration into the medical procedures in a way that is both

appropriate and effective. For example, when interpreting for a surgical procedure, a medical professional may not think to include the interpreter throughout the entirety of the procedure until the point that the deaf patient is fully asleep. The interpreter may need to suggest this to the professional in order to ensure effective communication throughout the entire time that the deaf patient is awake.

Legal

Interpreting in legal settings is not uncommon. As mentioned with other areas above, nearly everyone finds themselves in a legal situation at some point. Whether it is working with an attorney on a formal legal contract or in developing a will, attending a hearing as a witness, or being a defendant in a court proceeding, interpreters are often requested for legal assignments. In fact, many assignments that begin as nonlegal situations can become legal situations quickly. For example, you might be called to interpret at a school for a meeting that turns out to be an investigation about possible abuse for which the police are contacted, and you are asked to continue interpreting once the police arrive. As well, an interpreting assignment that begins with a Deaf couple attending an open house may end with a meeting at a real estate office to purchase the home, which necessitates translating several legal documents. Legal interpreting can take place in a variety of locations, including, but not limited to, an attorney's office, a police station, a courtroom, a court reporter's office, a jail, or even in a private home or business. When a Deaf person interacts with a legal professional or engages in a legal exchange or context, and an interpreter is involved, it is legal interpreting.

Legal interpreting should be viewed as a specialty area of interpreting. As such, interpreters who choose to work in legal situations should have additional training and experience above what is necessary to be a competent, successful general practitioner. A legal interpreter must first be an experienced and skilled interpreter with fluency in all languages used and possess a deep understanding of the process of interpreting. To develop the special knowledge and skills necessary for work as a legal interpreter, interpreters should begin by spending time with a mentor who is certified and experienced in legal interpreting. Additional training should be taken

that focuses on topics, such as legal systems, court processes and protocols, and legal language, as well as in practices that support the work of legal interpreting, such as note-taking skills, preparation techniques, and working in Deaf-hearing teams.

FORMS OF INTERPRETING

Simultaneous interpreting refers to the process of interpreting from one language into another language while the speaker, or the signer in the case of ASL, is delivering the message (see Russell, 2005; Napier, McKee, & Goswell, 2010). In other words, while someone is delivering a message in one language, a simultaneous interpreter renders the equivalent message in a second language without interrupting the speaker. Simultaneous interpreting is often considered more challenging than other forms of interpreting, as the interpreter must process information rapidly to accurately convey equivalent messages. The interpreter must render the interpreted message immediately and while continuing to process the ongoing message of the speaker. Simultaneous interpreting is able to occur more frequently when a signed language is used, because the act of interpreting between a signed and spoken language can occur without disrupting the flow of communication. It would not be unusual for the majority of signed language interpreters' work to be done using simultaneous interpreting. You can see it in use during typical, day-to-day interpreting assignments, such as meetings, trainings, educational interactions, conferences, etc.

Consecutive interpreting occurs when the interpreter listens to, or watches, in the case of a signed language, the speaker deliver a message or part of a message and then delivers the interpretation in a different language (see Russell, 2005; Napier, McKee, & Goswell, 2010). Consecutive interpreting is not used as frequently in the field of signed language interpreting, but is often used in high-risk interactions, such as legal and medical exchanges. There are benefits to using consecutive interpreting, such as allowing the interpreter to gain a full understanding of the context, intent, and deep meaning of the message and deliver an accurate message. The interpreter can take notes while listening to the speaker and then use those notes when delivering the interpretation.

Sight translation is the process of changing a frozen form of one language, such as English, to either a spoken or signed language. As a signed language interpreter, you may be called upon to interpret into sign language a standard form (e.g., a medical history survey, a legal contract). Often, sight translation occurs without time to review the form or work on a formal translation. An example would be a signed language interpreter being hired to interpret into ASL an apartment lease for a Deaf person seeking to rent an apartment. The lease is a standard document frozen in written English, and the interpreter would interpret each part of the form into ASL.

It is worth noting the differences between interpreting and transliterating. Interpreting is essentially work between two different and unique languages, such as spoken English and ASL. Transliterating is working between two forms of the same language, for example, working between spoken English and signed English.

Models of Interpreting

As suggested in the beginning of this chapter, interpreting is really about communicating. When two or more people who do not share a common language wish to communicate with one another, an interpreter who understands both languages is needed to allow communication to occur. As suggested by Wilcox and Shaffer (2005, p. 27), “Although the interpreting situation is a unique communicative event, and the process of interpreting between two languages and two cultures places special constraints and demands on the interpreter, all acts of interpreting can ultimately be reduced to acts of communication.” Wilcox and Shaffer posit that in order to really understand the process of interpreting, an interpreter must first understand the process of communicating. Over the years, within the field of both spoken and signed language interpreting, a variety of models of interpretation have been developed. These models of interpretation have provided a framework that examines the role of the interpreter as well as the process involved in the active interpreting. These models of interpretation have suggested a variety of roles that an interpreter plays in the interpreting process. The various models used to frame the work of an interpreter have changed over the years. An understanding of these models will help provide context to future interpreters. As research into the field of signed language interpreting continues, new models of interpreting will more than likely be developed.

The Helper Model

In the beginning, there were family members and friends; there were neighbors and ministers; there were teachers and dorm parents. There were many who were signers, usually because they had family members who were Deaf or worked at a Deaf school, or in a Deaf ministry. These people often came to the rescue when communicative actions without sign were not successful, expedient, or easy. Really, interpreting has been around far longer than the formal field of interpreting itself. These well-meaning friends and family who knew sign were always willing to help out and sign for their Deaf friend or family member when needed. There was rarely compensation, and until the late 1940s, no real preparation or training to be an interpreter. There was, however, a desire to help a friend out or to see a family member not be taken advantage of when engaging with a nonsigner. As Nancy Frishberg (1990, p. 10) states, "Often the interpreters were family members, neighbors, or friends who obliged a deaf relative or friend by 'pitching in' during a difficult communication situation."

An unintended consequence of this helper approach to Deaf–hearing interactions was the spread of the misguided belief on the part of nonsigners that Deaf people were not all that capable of handling things on their own or not able to succeed professionally without the help of some signing friend or family. Although the helper model is probably the earliest model of interpreting, and one that relied on the assistance of family and close friends, it led interpreters to take on the role of assisting and enabling their Deaf friends and family more so than truly help them as Deaf people. Many stories can be shared by Deaf people of the interpreter who carried their bags, stopped by to remind them of their appointments, or answered questions on their behalf. Although more than likely well-meaning, those in the helper mode did not always do the most good for their clients.

The Conduit Model

The conduit model came about after people began to realize that operating within the helper model was not in the best interest of the Deaf people. We saw a shift from one extreme to another, as interpreters began to see themselves only as a communication conduit or link between their deaf clients and their nonsigning clients. The shift in the paradigm

coincided with the establishment of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) in 1964 and the new emphasis on the professionalism of interpreting. As Wilcox and Shaffer (2005) suggest, "'Helping' out was no longer always viewed as admirable, but instead as a potential intrusion." So, a new model was born, in which the interpreter was compared with a telephone line that simply transmitted information back and forth between multiple parties. This philosophical view of interpreters as only a conduit influenced not only how interpreters performed their work, but also how people interpreted the recently developed code of ethics for interpreters. Interpreters began to see themselves as not really being involved at all in the situation or exchange and having no impact on the act of communicating. Additionally, interpreters strived to deliver everything they received, in either language, rendering volumes of information without regard for meaning. This model of interpreting led to the use of multiple metaphors of interpreters as a telephone, a robot, or a machine, all of which took the human aspect of the interpreter out of the exchange—often to the detriment of all involved and certainly to the success of the communicative act.

The Sociolinguistic Model

Dennis Cokely developed and published his sociolinguistic model of interpreting in the early 1990s and posited that the process of interpreting includes both a sender and receiver of a message and is a linear process, although multiple processes may occur simultaneously. Cokely's model begins with the reception of a message, hence the assumption of both a sender and a receiver, followed by the processing of that message for intent and equivalency, and ends with the formation, production, and delivery of the interpretation in the target language.

The Colonomos Model

Betty Colonomos, whose work was heavily influenced by Seleskovitch (1978), developed a model of interpreting that focused on ascertaining both the meaning and intent of a speaker's message without necessarily the restraints of the language of the source message. Colonomos' model, originally referred to as a *pedagogical model* or the *Colonomos model*, became

what is known today as the *integrated model of interpreting* (IMI). The IMI stresses the receipt of a source message, an analysis of the message's meaning, and the delivery of an equivalent message in the target language while emphasizing the importance of both analysis and compositional factors that ultimately influence the final interpretation. It has been suggested that the Colonomos model is, at its core, a conduit model (see Wilcox & Shaffer, 2005).

The Cognitive Model

A cognitive model of interpreting, similar in basic process to the Colonomos model, was proposed by Stewart, Schein, and Cartwright in 1998 with the publication of their text, *Sign Language Interpreting: Exploring its Art and Science*. The cognitive model developed by Stewart and his colleagues basically shows the process of interpreting beginning with a source message (i.e., the original message from the speaker) and ending with a final interpreted message in the target language (i.e., the language used by the recipient of the message). In between the two messages, the interpreter processes the message by comprehending the message, analyzing it for meaning, encoding it into the target language, and delivering it to the recipient in the target language. The interpreter ends the process by evaluating the target message for equivalency and making adjustments as needed. This model begins with an assumption that the interpreters already comprehend what they are receiving from the speaker.

The Bilingual-Bicultural Model

What the models described above do not take into account, as they describe and focus on the interpreting process, is the connection between language, its users, and the culture from which the language users come. A model first proposed by Arjona and Ingram in the 1990s (see Roy, 1993) made the connection between language and culture, and emphasized that an interpreter works between, at a minimum, two cultures and two languages. In doing so, the interpreter must be able to address cultural differences and be skilled at bridging or mediating these differences, thereby bringing the people who are communicating with one another *together*. Interpreters not only worked

to ensure the fidelity and equivalence of the linguistic message, but also focused their efforts on mediating or bridging the different cultures within which the communicative exchange was occurring. Originally referred to as the *communication-facilitator model*, Arjona and Ingram's model later became more commonly referred to as the *bilingual-bicultural model*, and it is the primary lens through which interpreters have been taught since the mid-1990s.

Interpreters operating within this model recognize differences in culture as well as language and strive to achieve equivalence across the interaction by not only mediating language differences (i.e., interpreting between ASL and English), but also by mediating cultural differences as well. In their text, *So You Want to Be an Interpreter? An Introduction to Sign Language Interpreting*, Humphrey and Alcorn state that in the bilingual-bicultural model, interpreters are "keenly aware of the inherent differences in the languages, cultures, norms for social interaction and schema of the parties using interpreting services" (2007, p. 178), and that obtaining an effective interpretation "requires cultural and linguistic mediation while accomplishing speaker goals and maintaining dynamic equivalence" (2007, p. 178).

Other Cognitive Process Models

On the surface, one might assume that the work of an interpreter is fairly straight forward. An interpreter receives (i.e., hears or sees) a message in one language and then conveys the equivalent message in another language. However, the processes involved in this communicative act are both complex and numerous. According to Russell, "interpreting, whether simultaneous or consecutive, is a highly complex discourse interchange where language perception, comprehension, translation and production operations are carried out virtually in parallel" (2005, p. 136). Researchers have examined the process of interpreting over the years and offered rather complex models of what happens with the information received and conveyed by interpreters. Three prominent models of simultaneous interpreting that emerged worth noting are those developed by David Gerver (1976), Barbara Moser-Mercer (1978), and Daniel Gile (1985). Each examined the process of interpreting.

The model developed by David Gerver and first published in 1976, emphasized the memory systems used during the interpreting process. Gerver suggested that the information an interpreter receives (i.e., the message in the source language) is kept in a short-term memory area, or *buffer* as Gerver describes it, whereas previously received information is decoded from the source language, encoded into the target language, and eventually delivered as the equivalent message in the target language. Gerver's model allows for the testing of the encoded message against the source message, as needed. The buffer identified by Gerver is where the incoming chunks of the message are retained while prior chunks are interpreted. This model was, by Gerver's own revelation, a beginning point in modeling what occurs during the interpreting process. Although no mention in the original model was made of the interpreter's understanding of the message, the process did start the discussions and research into exactly what transpires when a person interprets.

Originally based on a model of understanding speech, Moser's model (1978) also emphasized the role of memory in the interpretation process. As with Gerver's model, working memory is, in essence, a storage area for the message received by the interpreter while it is being decoded, analyzed, and encoded into the target language. Unlike Gerver's depiction of the process, however, Moser's view of memory included specific functional purposes or tasks and not solely a structural function of memory. In the Moser model, memory not only stored incoming information, but also worked to process the message, changing the phrase linguistically into meaningful chunks in the target language. This model, like Gerver's, suggests a formal depiction of how information is processed by an interpreter.

In an effort to represent the process of interpreting as a framework for interpreting students, Daniel Gile (1985) chose to represent what occurs during the interpreting process by emphasizing the work or effort that is required. His model identified separate efforts that occur: listening and analysis (L), production (P), memory (M), and coordination (C). The listening and analysis effort focuses on the receiving and comprehension of the original message in the source language as well as the identification of words and the determination of what the message or utterance means. Memory effort is about the storage of the language utterances once received and during the process of interpreting, similar to what Gerver and Moser presented in

their models. The production effort is what occurs from the moment the interpreter begins to mentally determine what the source message means and includes the planning of the delivery of the equivalent message in the target language. The coordination effort focuses on the overall effort of the interpreter in managing everything in the process, including focus and self-monitoring. These efforts can then be used to represent simultaneous interpreting as follows:

$$SI = L + P + M + C$$

Models Influencing Consecutive Interpreting

In her chapter on *Consecutive and Simultaneous Interpreting*, Debra Russell presents a detailed review of several models, some of which were discussed above, that have had an impact on both simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. According to Russell, "the value of some of these models to the field of ASL-English interpreting is that they offer guidance in understanding the nature of how communicators structure their messages and how interpreters try to capture that meaning in order to recreate it in a second language" (2005, p. 142). Russell then discusses a model she developed and calls the *meaning-based interpreting model*, which has five steps and

> identifies the need for the interpreter to assess and apply the contextual factors impacting the interpretation, actively using her background knowledge about language, culture, conventional ways of communication in both English and ALS, and to determine whether to use consecutive or simultaneous interpreting within a given interaction (2005, p. 144).

CONCLUSION

In the introduction of *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, editors Franz Pöchhacker and Miriam Shlesinger begin with a powerful statement that expresses "While interpreting as a form of mediating across boundaries of language and culture has been instrumental in human communication since earliest times, its recognition as something to be studied and observed is relatively recent" (2002, p. 1). This text has been developed for

students and aspiring interpreters, both Deaf and hearing, who are beginning their own study and observation of interpreting. This book is intended to provide an overview of how interpreters become qualified to serve in a rapidly changing marketplace. The authors seek to give readers a broad knowledge base that encompasses the latest research, addresses current trends, and promotes critical thinking and open dialogue about working conditions, ethics, boundaries, and competencies needed by a highly qualified interpreter (or translator) in various settings. In this first chapter, a foundation was laid for your study of interpreting with the identification and explanation of key words you need to understand as you proceed to learn about interpreting (please see the Appendix). You also examined how interpreting is done and in what settings, including learning about the role of technology in the work of interpreters. The idea of specializations within the field of interpreting was introduced in this chapter, including a review of work as an educational, legal, and healthcare interpreter. Some of these areas will be further expanded upon in later chapters. The two primary processes or forms of interpreting, simultaneous and consecutive, were introduced in this chapter, and some of the key models of the work of interpreters were reviewed as well. These key concepts will provide you the foundation you need to continue your study of interpreting through the remaining chapters of the book.

Resources and References

Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 328.

Berge, S. (2014). Social and private speech in an interpreted meeting of deafblind persons. *Interpreting*, *16*(1), 82–106.

Cokely, D. (1992). *Interpreting: A sociolinguistic model.* Burtonsville, MD: Linstok Press.

Colonomos, B. (1992). *Process of interpreting and transliterating: Making them work for you.* Workshop handout: Front Range Community College, Westminster, CO.

Education of the Handicapped Act, sec. 601(c), 20 U.S.C. 1401 (1975).

Frishberg, N. (1986). *Interpreting: An introduction.* Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Gerver, D. (1976). Empirical studies of simultaneous interpretation: A review and a model. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), *Translation. Application and research* (pp. 165–207). New York: Garden Press.

Gile, D. (1985). Le modele d'efforts et l'equilibre d'interpretation en interpretation simultanee. *Meta*, *30*(1), 44–48.

Hauser, P. C., Finch, K. L., & Hauser, A. B. (2008). *Deaf professionals and designated interpreters: A new paradigm*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Humphrey, J. H., & Alcorn, B. J. (2007). *So you want to be an interpreter? An introduction to sign language interpreting*. Seattle, WA: H & H Publishing Company.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (1990, 2004).

International Association of Conference Interpreters. (2011). *Staff Interpreters*. Geneva, Switzerland: AIIC. Retrieved from http://aiic.net/p/4010>

International Organization for Standardization. *Interpreting: Guidelines for community interpreting*. [Foreword]. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO. Retrieved from https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:13611:ed-1:v1:en

Johnson, L., Bolster, L., & Brown, S. (2014). *States that require or accept the EIPA: Summary*. Denver, CO: University of Northern Colorado, Distance Opportunities for Interpreters and Teachers Center. Retrieved from http://www.unco.edu/cebs/asl-interpreting/pdf/osep-project/eipa-data-summary.pdf

Merriam-Webster Inc. (n.d.). *Interpret*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/interpret

Moser-Mercer, B. (1978). Simultaneous interpretation: A theoretical model and its practical application. In D. Gerver and W. H. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language, interpretation and communication* (pp. 353–368). New York: Plenum Press.

Napier, J., McKee, R., & Goswell, D. (2010). *Sign language interpreting: Theory and practice in Australia and New Zealand*. 2nd edition. Sydney, NSW: The Federation Press.

Pöchhacker, F., & Shlesinger, M. (2002). *The interpreting studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2007). *Video relay service interpreting*. [Standard practice paper]. Alexandria, VA: RID Publications. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3DKvZMflFLdNE1zZGRPdDN4NGM/view

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2010). *An overview of K-12 educational interpreting*. [Standard practice paper]. Alexandria, VA: RID Publications. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3DKvZMflFLdcFE2N25NM1NkaGs/view

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2010). *Video remote interpreting*. [Standard practice paper]. Alexandria, VA: RID Publications. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3DKvZMflFLdTkk4QnM3T1JRR1U/view

Roy, C. B. (1993). The problem with definitions, descriptions and the role of metaphors of interpreters. *Journal of Interpretation*, *6*(1), 127–154.

Roy, C. B. (2000). *Interpreting as a discourse process*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Russell, D. (2005). Consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting* (pp. 135–164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Seleskovitch, D. (1978). *Interpreting for international conferences.* Washington, DC: Pen and Booth.

Stewart, D. A., Schein, J. D., & Cartwright, B. E. (1998). *Sign language interpreting: Exploring its art and science.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wilcox, S., & Shaffer, B. (2005). Towards a cognitive model of interpreting. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting: Theory and practice* (pp. 27–51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Winston, E. A. (1989). Transliteration: What's the message. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of the deaf community* (pp. 147–164). San Diego, CA. Academic Press.